

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

BRANDON G. EDMONDS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Civil Action 2:16-cv-921
Judge George C. Smith
Magistrate Judge Jolson**

LICKING COUNTY, et al.

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On September 27, 2016, this Court issued an Order noting that Plaintiff had neither paid the full filing fee nor submitted a request for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Doc. 2 at 1). Consequently, the Court ordered Plaintiff to pay the \$400.00 filing fee or file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within thirty (30) days of the Order. (*Id.*). The Court also warned Plaintiff that “his failure to do so [would] result in the dismissal of the action for want of prosecution.” (*Id.*). More than three months have passed since the Court’s Order and Plaintiff has neither paid the full filing fee nor submitted a request for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Consequently, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that this action be dismissed for want of prosecution.

Procedure on Objections to Report and Recommendation

If any party objects to this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Report, file and serve on all parties written objections to those specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made, together with supporting authority for the objection(s). A Judge of this Court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. Upon proper objections, a Judge of this Court may accept, reject, or

modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made herein, may receive further evidence or may recommit this matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to have the District Judge review the Report and Recommendation *de novo*, and also operates as a waiver of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the Report and Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: January 5, 2017

/s/ Kimberly A. Jolson
KIMBERLY A. JOLSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE